arXiv:1704.03431v1 [quant-ph] 11 Apr 2017

Universal Quantum Computation using Coherent $\chi^{(2)}$ Interactions

Murphy Yuezhen Niu,[1,2] Isaac L. Chuang,[1,2,3] and Jeffrey H. Shapiro[1,3]

[1]*Research Laboratory of Electronics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 77 Massachusetts Avenue, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139, USA*
[2]*Department of Physics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139, USA*
[3]*Department of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139, USA*

(Dated: April 12, 2017)

We show that universal quantum computation, in certain qubit and qutrit bases, can be realized using only linear optics and coherent $\chi^{(2)}$ (three-wave-mixing) interactions. Qutrit basis universality is proven from group theory: $\chi^{(2)}$ Hamiltonians and photon-number operators generate the full $\mathfrak{u}(3)$ Lie algebra in the two-photon-pump qutrit subspace, which, together with our construction of the qutrit controlled-phase gate, is universal. We also construct a universal dual-rail qubit-basis gate set using coherent $\chi^{(2)}$ interactions and linear optics that is amenable to near-term experimental implementation.

Introduction.— Photons are promising information carriers for quantum computers owing to photons' long room-temperature coherence time, high transmission speed, and high-fidelity preparation schemes [1–4], plus the availability of efficient photodetectors [5, 6], and the scalable on-chip integration of linear and nonlinear optical components [7–10]. Architectures for optics-based quantum computation have gone through dramatic developments over the past two decades [11–16], but significant obstacles remain to be overcome.

Optics-based quantum computation depends on photon-photon interactions for the realization of a universal gate set. The lowest order photon-photon interactions are described by unitary transformations of the form $\hat{U} = \exp(-i\hat{L})$, that are generated by general two-wave mixing Hamiltonians,

$$\hat{L} \in \{(g\hat{a}\hat{b} + g^*\hat{a}^\dagger\hat{b}^\dagger), (g\hat{a}\hat{b}^\dagger + g^*\hat{a}^\dagger\hat{b})\}, \tag{1}$$

where g is a c-number and $\hat{a}^\dagger$ and $\hat{b}^\dagger$ are photon-creation operators from different optical modes, so that $[\hat{a}, \hat{b}^\dagger] = 0$, or the same optical mode, for which $[\hat{a}, \hat{b}^\dagger] = 1$. Unitary transformations of this form can realize universal single-qubit rotations in the Fock-state basis but are not universal for quantum computation without some additional resource [16, 17]. To implement universal optics-based quantum computation, four-wave mixing (a $\chi^{(3)}$ interaction) has long been considered to be the lowest-order optical nonlinearity that will suffice. The inherent weakness of $\chi^{(3)}$ interactions, however, has precluded their delivering the high-fidelity gates required to make optics-based quantum computation practical [18–20]. Linear-optical quantum computation (LOQC) [13, 21–23] circumvents the need for photon-photon interactions through postselection, but this approach comes with the need for a prohibitive number of perfect single-photon ancillae to cope with LOQC's probabilistic nature and ubiquitous photon loss [14, 24–26].

We circumvent the weakness of photon-photon interactions that has hobbled realizing optics-based quantum computation by instead employing the *lowest*-order nonlinearity that can provide universal quantum computation, viz., the $\chi^{(2)}$ interaction whose three-wave-mixing Hamiltonians can be decomposed into linear combinations of the following terms:

$$\hat{G}_1 = \frac{i\kappa}{2}\left[\hat{a}_s^\dagger\hat{a}_i^\dagger\hat{a}_p - \hat{a}_s\hat{a}_i\hat{a}_p^\dagger\right], \tag{2}$$

$$\hat{G}_2 = \frac{\kappa}{2}\left[\hat{a}_s^\dagger\hat{a}_i^\dagger\hat{a}_p + \hat{a}_s\hat{a}_i\hat{a}_p^\dagger\right]. \tag{3}$$

Here, $\{\hat{a}_k^\dagger : k = s, i, p\}$ are the photon-creation operators of the interaction's signal, idler, and pump modes, and the real-valued κ quantifies the interaction's strength. We shall allow $\hat{a}_s^\dagger$ and $\hat{a}_i^\dagger$ to be associated with different modes or the same mode—as we did for $\hat{a}^\dagger$ and $\hat{b}^\dagger$ in our two-wave mixing Hamiltonians—but we will always require the pump mode to be distinct from the signal and idler modes. Because the κ values for conventional $\chi^{(2)}$ media are very low, these materials are usually used with one of the signal, idler, or pump modes being in a strong coherent state. Then, to a good approximation, that mode is not attenuated by the $\chi^{(2)}$ interaction, permitting its creation operator $\hat{a}^\dagger$ to be replaced with a c-number α^*, and reducing the $\chi^{(2)}$ Hamiltonian to a two-wave-mixing Hamiltonian $\hat{L}$, which, as noted earlier, is not universal for quantum computation. To distinguish the $\chi^{(2)}$ quantum dynamics arising from Eqs. (2) and (3) from their reduction to two-wave mixing when one mode is in a nondepleting coherent state, we call the former a coherent $\chi^{(2)}$ interaction and the latter an incoherent $\chi^{(2)}$ interaction.

The efficiencies of coherent $\chi^{(2)}$ interactions have been steadily improving over the past decade [27–34], bringing full utilization of their quantum dynamics closer to reality. As yet, however, their quantum computational capabilities have received little attention, owing to the lack of a Lie group theoretic understanding of $\chi^{(2)}$-Hamiltonian evolutions.

In this Letter, we use Lie group theory to prove that coherent $\chi^{(2)}$ interactions plus linear optics can provide a strictly universal gate set for quantum computation. First, we demonstrate their universality in a qutrit basis that spans the $\chi^{(2)}$ Hamiltonian's three-dimensional irreducible subspace. Then, we show that these resources also provide universality in the single-photon dual-rail qubit basis. For experimental realizations, we exhibit specific universal gate set constructions for both the qutrit and qubit bases.

Universality in the Qutrit Basis.— For our universality proofs we need two gadgets made possible by coherent $\chi^{(2)}$ interactions—second-harmonic generation (SHG) and type-I phase-matched spontaneous parametric down-conversion (SPDC)—plus a phase-shift gadget. Our SHG gadget takes a frequency-ω, two-photon Fock state from a particular mode and converts into a single-photon Fock state at frequency 2ω. Our SPDC gadget takes a frequency-2ω, single-photon Fock-state input, and converts it into a two-photon Fock state at frequency ω. Our phase-shift gadget realizes the unitary transformation

$$\hat{U}(\theta) = \exp(i\theta\hat{N}), \tag{4}$$

that is generated by the photon-number operator $\hat{N} \equiv \hat{a}^\dagger\hat{a}$ for the mode with creation operator $\hat{a}^\dagger$.

The Hilbert space of states for the signal, idler, and pump modes in Eqs. (2) and (3) is the direct sum of the irreducible subspaces of $\chi^{(2)}$-Hamiltonian evolution that are labeled by their pump mode's maximum photon number, n, and spanned by the Fock-state bases $\{|0,0,n\rangle, |1,1,n-1\rangle, \ldots, |n,n,0\rangle\}$, where $|n_s, n_i, n_p\rangle$ is the $\hat{N}_s \otimes \hat{N}_i \otimes \hat{N}_p$ eigenstate containing n_s signal photons, n_i idler photons, and n_p pump photons. We define our logical qutrit states in the two-pump-photon subspace $\mathcal{H}_3 = \text{Span}[\{|0,0,2\rangle, |1,1,1\rangle, |2,2,0\rangle\}]$ to be

$$|\tilde{0}\rangle = \hat{a}_s^\dagger\hat{a}_i^\dagger\hat{a}_p^\dagger|0,0,0\rangle = |1,1,1\rangle, \tag{5}$$

$$|\tilde{1}\rangle = \frac{1}{2}\hat{a}_s^{\dagger 2}\hat{a}_i^{\dagger 2}|0,0,0\rangle = |2,2,0\rangle, \tag{6}$$

$$|\tilde{2}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\hat{a}_p^{\dagger 2}|0,0,0\rangle = |0,0,2\rangle. \tag{7}$$

These states can be efficiently prepared by type-II phase-matched SPDC in the two-pump-photon subspace [34] and are naturally confined to this subspace under coherent $\chi^{(2)}$ interactions. It follows that linear combinations of $\hat{G}_1, \hat{G}_2, \hat{N}_s, \hat{N}_i, \hat{N}_p$ and their nested commutators when restricted to the qutrit subspace $\mathcal{H}_3$ constitute a Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$. The Lie group H associated with $\mathfrak{g}$ is found from the exponential map $\exp : \mathfrak{g} \to H$, where for each group element $\hat{h} \in H$, $\exists \hat{E} \in \mathfrak{g}$ and $t \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\hat{h} = \exp(it\hat{E})$. An irreducible representation of H is then labeled by the pump mode's maximum photon number $n = (n_s + n_i)/2 + n_p$. For simplicity, in all that follows, we set $\kappa = 1$ in the Hamiltonians $\hat{G}_1$ and $\hat{G}_2$. We begin our universality demonstration with a theorem about $\mathfrak{g}$.

Theorem 1. The Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ is $\mathfrak{u}(3)$.

Proof: First we prove that $\mathfrak{u}(3) \subset \mathfrak{g}$. Given the $\chi^{(2)}$ Hamiltonians $\hat{G}_1$ and $\hat{G}_2$, we can obtain the transformation effected by $i[\hat{G}_1, \hat{G}_2]$ from the following state evolution [16]

$$e^{i\hat{G}_1\delta t}e^{i\hat{G}_2\delta t}e^{-i\hat{G}_1\delta t}e^{-i\hat{G}_2\delta t} = e^{[\hat{G}_1,\hat{G}_2]\delta t^2} + O(\delta t^3), \tag{8}$$

for $\delta t \ll 1$. In a similar manner, we can obtain all transformations generated by linear combinations of $\hat{G}_1$, $\hat{G}_2$, $\hat{N}_s$, $\hat{N}_i$ $\hat{N}_p$ and their nested commutators. Thus, using the vector $\mathbf{v^T} \equiv [\, v_0 \;\; v_1 \;\; v_2 \,]$ to represent the qutrit $|\psi\rangle = v_0|1,1,1\rangle + v_1|2,2,0\rangle + v_2|0,0,2\rangle$, we obtain the matrix representations

$$\hat{G}_1 = \frac{i}{2}\left[\hat{a}_s^\dagger\hat{a}_i^\dagger\hat{a}_p - \hat{a}_s\hat{a}_i\hat{a}_p^\dagger\right] = \frac{-i}{2}\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 2 & \sqrt{2} \\ -2 & 0 & 0 \\ -\sqrt{2} & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \tag{9}$$

$$\hat{G}_2 = \frac{1}{2}\left[\hat{a}_s^\dagger\hat{a}_i^\dagger\hat{a}_p + \hat{a}_s\hat{a}_i\hat{a}_p^\dagger\right] = \frac{1}{2}\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 2 & \sqrt{2} \\ 2 & 0 & 0 \\ \sqrt{2} & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \tag{10}$$

$$\hat{G}_3 = i[\hat{G}_1, \hat{G}_2] = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \tag{11}$$

$$\hat{G}_4 = i[\hat{G}_2, \hat{G}_3] = 3\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \tag{12}$$

$$\hat{G}_5 = i[\hat{G}_3, \hat{G}_1] = 3i\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \tag{13}$$

$$\hat{G}_6 = \frac{1}{2}\left(i[\hat{G}_1, \hat{G}_4] + i[\hat{G}_5, \hat{G}_2]\right) = \frac{3}{4}\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \tag{14}$$

$$\hat{G}_7 = i[\hat{G}_4, \hat{G}_2] = \frac{3i}{4}\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \tag{15}$$

$$\hat{G}_8 = \frac{1}{2}(1 - \hat{N}_p) = \frac{1}{2}\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 \end{bmatrix}, \tag{16}$$

$$\hat{G}_9 = \frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{\hat{N}_s + \hat{N}_i}{2} + \hat{N}_p\right) = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \tag{17}$$

where the second equalities apply in the qutrit subspace $\mathcal{H}_3$. It is then straightforward to verify that the Gell-Mann matrices arising from linear combinations of the above generators are:

$$\hat{\lambda}_1 = \hat{G}_4/3, \qquad \hat{\lambda}_2 = -\hat{G}_5/3, \tag{18}$$

$$\hat{\lambda}_3 = 2\hat{G}_8 + \hat{G}_3, \qquad \hat{\lambda}_4 = \sqrt{2}(\hat{G}_2 - \hat{G}_4/3), \tag{19}$$

$$\hat{\lambda}_5 = \sqrt{2}(\hat{G}_1 - \hat{G}_5/3), \qquad \hat{\lambda}_6 = 4\hat{G}_6/3, \tag{20}$$

$$\hat{\lambda}_7 = 4\hat{G}_7/3, \qquad \hat{\lambda}_8 = (\hat{G}_3 + 6\hat{G}_8)/\sqrt{3}. \tag{21}$$

Gell-Mann matrices are one representation of the complete set of linearly independent generators for the $\mathfrak{su}(3)$ Lie algebra. Together with $\hat{G}_9$ they form the complete set of generators for $\mathfrak{u}(3)$, proving that $\mathfrak{u}(3) \subset \mathfrak{g}$.

We complete our proof of Theorem 1 by showing that $\mathfrak{g} \subset \mathfrak{u}(3)$. Because the qutrit subspace $\mathcal{H}_3$ is closed under $\mathfrak{g}$, every Lie group element $\hat{h} \in H$ is generated by an $\hat{E} \in \mathfrak{g}$ via $\hat{h} = \exp(it\hat{E})$ for some $t \in \mathbb{R}$. As $\exp(it\hat{E})$ is a unitary transformation in the qutrit subspace, we have $H \subset U(3)$. Furthermore, this condition holds if and only if $\mathfrak{g} \subset \mathfrak{u}(3)$, thus finishing Theorem 1's proof.

Refs. [35–37] show that if operators $\{\hat{G}_k\}$ and their nested commutators generate the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{u}(3^m)$, then they can

be used to construct a universal set of unitaries $U_k(t) = \exp(-it\hat{G}_k)$ in the m-qutrit subspace. Setting $m = 1$ we have the following claim.

Claim 1. Universal single-qutrit rotations can be realized by coherent $\chi^{(2)}$ interactions and phase-shift transformations.

Universal qutrit computation entails not only universal single-qutrit unitaries but also universal two-qutrit unitary transformations in $\mathcal{H}_3^{\otimes 2}$, so we need the following theorem.

Theorem 2. Universal qutrit quantum computation can be realized with coherent $\chi^{(2)}$ Hamiltonians and phase-shift transformations.

Proof: From Claim 1 we know that arbitrary $U(3)$ qutrit rotations can be realized with coherent $\chi^{(2)}$ interactions and phase-shift transformations. It is also known [11, 38–40] that a universal single-qudit gate set plus a controlled-phase gate are universal for qudit computation. So, we will complete Theorem 2's proof by exhibiting how the controlled-phase gate $\Lambda[X_3(\phi)]$ [11, 38] can be realized with coherent $\chi^{(2)}$ interactions and phase-shift transformations. The matrix representation of $\Lambda[X_3(\phi)]$ in the two-qutrit basis is

$$\Lambda[X_3(\phi)] = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{1}_6 & \mathbf{0}_{6\times 3} \\ \mathbf{0}_{3\times 6} & X_3(\phi) \end{bmatrix}, \tag{22}$$

where $\mathbf{1}_6$ is the 6×6 identity matrix and $\mathbf{0}_{n\times m}$ is the $n \times m$ all-zeros matrix that operate on the basis states $\{|\tilde{0},\tilde{0}\rangle, |\tilde{0},\tilde{1}\rangle, |\tilde{0},\tilde{2}\rangle, |\tilde{1},\tilde{0}\rangle, |\tilde{1},\tilde{1}\rangle, |\tilde{1},\tilde{2}\rangle\}$, and

$$X_3(\phi) = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{1}_2 & \mathbf{0}_{2\times 1} \\ \mathbf{0}_{1\times 2} & e^{i\phi} \end{bmatrix}, \tag{23}$$

acts on the basis states $\{|\tilde{2},\tilde{0}\rangle, |\tilde{2},\tilde{1}\rangle, |\tilde{2},\tilde{2}\rangle\}$, imparting a phase shift ϕ conditioned on the second qutrit's being $|\tilde{2}\rangle$.

Our construction of the two-qutrit controlled-phase gate, which is shown schematically in Fig. 1 and described below, relies on the following optical encoding for the signal, idler, and pump. Each basis qutrit from Eqs. (5)-(7) is a state $|n_s, n_i, n_p\rangle$ in the $\chi^{(2)}$ Hamiltonian's two-pump-photon irreducible subspace. For such states we shall assume that the signal, idler, and pump are in the same spatial mode, with the signal and idler orthogonally polarized and in the same frequency-ω temporal mode, while the pump is at frequency 2ω. With this encoding in hand, we now explain how the Fig. 1 setup realizes the $\Lambda[X_3(\phi)]$ gate.

The top and bottom rails in Fig. 1 are the control and target qutrit lines, respectively. These qutrits first undergo SHG interactions that are phase-matched for doubling their pump modes' frequencies from 2ω to 4ω. These SHG operations *only* effect state transformations when their input states contain two pump photons, in which case the two frequency-2ω pump photons become a single frequency-4ω pump photon. Next, because we must combine the control and target qutrits' pump modes on a single rail, we use a quantum-state frequency conversion (QFC1) stage to shift the frequency of the control qutrit's pump photon—if present—from 4ω to $4\omega'$. At this point dichroic mirrors (DMs) direct the frequency-$4\omega'$ and frequency-4ω control and target photons—if they are present—to another DM that combines them on a single rail where they undergo the unitary transformation $e^{i2\phi\hat{G}'_3}$ that is generated by



FIG. 1. Schematic for constructing the controlled-phase gate $\Lambda[X_3(\phi)]$ from coherent $\chi^{(2)}$ interactions and linear optics. The top and bottom rails are the control and target rails, respectively. SHG: second-harmonic generation. QFC: quantum-state frequency conversion. DM: dichroic mirror. SPDC: type-I phase-matched spontaneous parametric down-conversion. See the text for the explanation of how this setup realizes the $\Lambda[X_3(\phi)]$ state transformation.

$$\hat{G}'_3 = (\hat{N}'_{p_c}\hat{N}_{p_a} + \hat{N}'_{p_t}\hat{N}_{p_a} - \hat{N}'_{p_c}\hat{N}'_{p_t} + \hat{N}_{p_a})/2, \tag{24}$$

with $\hat{N}'_{p_c} = \hat{a}'^{\dagger}_{p_c}\hat{a}'_{p_c}$ and $\hat{N}'_{p_t} = \hat{a}'^{\dagger}_{p_t}\hat{a}'_{p_t}$ being the number operators for the frequency-$4\omega'$ and frequency-4ω pump modes of the control and target qutrits, and $\hat{N}_{p_a}$ the number operator for a vacuum-state auxiliary mode needed to make $\hat{G}'_3$ analogous to $\hat{G}_3$ from Eq. (11). Now, because the auxiliary mode is in its vacuum state, $e^{i2\phi\hat{G}'_3}$ imparts a phase shift ϕ to the $\hat{a}'_{p_t}$ mode's single-photon Fock state when the $\hat{a}'_{p_c}$ mode is in its single-photon Fock state. Thus, the $e^{2i\phi\hat{G}'_3}$ transformation is equivalent to the conditional ϕ-rad phase shift produced the cross-Kerr effect [12]. To see that this operation can be realized with coherent $\chi^{(2)}$ interactions, we introduce $\hat{G}'_1 \equiv i[\hat{a}'^{\dagger}_{p_c}\hat{a}'^{\dagger}_{p_t}\hat{a}_{p_a} - \hat{a}'_{p_c}\hat{a}'_{p_t}\hat{a}^{\dagger}_{p_a}]/2$ and $\hat{G}'_2 \equiv [\hat{a}'^{\dagger}_{p_c}\hat{a}'^{\dagger}_{p_t}\hat{a}_{p_a} + \hat{a}'_{p_c}\hat{a}'_{p_t}\hat{a}^{\dagger}_{p_a}]/2$. Then, from Eqs. (8) and (11), we have that

$$e^{2i\phi\hat{G}'_3} = e^{-i\sqrt{2\phi}\,\hat{G}'_1}e^{-i\sqrt{2\phi}\,\hat{G}'_2}e^{i\sqrt{2\phi}\,\hat{G}'_1}e^{i\sqrt{2\phi}\,\hat{G}'_2}, \tag{25}$$

for $0 < \phi$ with ϕ sufficiently small.

After the preceding conditional phase shift, another DM directs the $\hat{a}'_{p_c}$ and $\hat{a}'_{p_t}$ modes to different DMs that are used to recombine them on the control and target rails, respectively, with the $\{\hat{a}_{s_c}, \hat{a}_{i_c}\}$ and $\{\hat{a}_{s_t}, \hat{a}_{i_t}\}$ modes that are already there. The control rail's modes then enter QFC2, which undoes QFC1's quantum-state frequency conversion, mapping that rail's pump-mode frequency back to 4ω. Finally, the type-I phase-matched SPDC blocks in the control and target rails convert a single-photon Fock state in a rail's frequency-4ω pump mode to a two-photon Fock state in that rail's frequency-2ω pump mode. The resulting transformation from the joint state $|\psi\rangle_{\rm in} = \sum_{n=0}^{2}\sum_{m=0}^{2} c_{nm}^{\rm in}|\tilde{n}\rangle_c|\tilde{m}\rangle_t$ of the control and target at the input to the Fig. 1 setup to the joint state of the control and target at that setup's output is then $|\psi\rangle_{\rm out} = \Lambda[X_3(\phi)]|\psi\rangle_{\rm in}$, so that we have indeed constructed a controlled-phase gate from coherent $\chi^{(2)}$ interactions and linear optics. Together with Claim 1, this construction completes the proof of Theorem 2.

Universality in the Qubit Basis.— It is known [41] that the Hadamard and controlled-phase gates are strictly universal for qubit quantum computation, thus we will prove that linear optics and coherent $\chi^{(2)}$ interactions provide strict qubit-basis universality by constructing these two gates in the single-photon dual-rail basis with just those resources. We take the logical qubits for our qubit basis to be

$$|\tilde{0}\rangle = |10\rangle = \hat{a}_1^\dagger|00\rangle, \tag{26}$$

$$|\tilde{1}\rangle = |01\rangle = \hat{a}_2^\dagger|00\rangle, \tag{27}$$

in terms of the physical-qubit Fock states $|n_1 n_2\rangle$ for rails 1 and 2's spatial modes. In the single-photon dual-rail basis the Hadamard gate we need can be realized with a 50–50 beam splitter plus a π-rad phase shifter [42]. In the single-photon dual-rail basis the controlled-phase gate, $\Lambda(S)$, with the first qubit being the control while the second is the target, has the following matrix representation in the the logical-qubit basis

$$\Lambda(S) = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{1}_2 & \mathbf{0}_2 \\ \mathbf{0}_2 & S \end{bmatrix}, \tag{28}$$

where $\mathbf{1}_2$ is the 2×2 identity matrix, $\mathbf{0}_2$ is the 2×2 all-zeros matrix, and

$$S = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & i \end{bmatrix}, \tag{29}$$

so that $\Lambda(S)$ applies a $\pi/2$-rad phase shift to the logical qubit $|\tilde{1}\rangle$. Our paper's final result is the following theorem.

Theorem 3. Universal qubit quantum computation can be realized with coherent $\chi^{(2)}$ interactions and linear optics.

Proof: Because linear optics suffice for constructing the Hadamard gate in the single-photon dual-rail basis, we will prove Theorem 3 by showing that the Fig. 2 setup realizes the $\Lambda(S)$ gate by means of linear-optics-enabled two-photon interference and coherent $\chi^{(2)}$ interactions. Let

$$|\psi\rangle_{\text{in}} = \sum_{n=0}^{1}\sum_{m=0}^{1} c_{nm}^{\text{in}}|\tilde{n}\rangle_c|\tilde{m}\rangle_t \tag{30}$$

be the joint state of the control (c) and target (t) modes at the input to the Fig. 2 setup. The single-photon Fock-state rails at this setup's input are combined on a 50–50 beam splitter. There, Hong-Ou-Mandel (HOM) two-photon interference [43] will occur if and only if single photons were present on *both* the $|\tilde{1}\rangle_c$ and $|\tilde{1}\rangle_t$ input rails, resulting in the entangled state $(|2\rangle_c|0\rangle_t + |0\rangle_c|2\rangle_t)/\sqrt{2}$ entering the SHG blocks. These SHG blocks convert a two-photon Fock state at frequency ω to a single-photon Fock state at frequency 2ω, and the first DM block following each SHG directs the frequency-2ω photon—if present at its input—to a $\pi/2$-rad phase shift. The SHG blocks, however, have no effect on a single-photon Fock state, so *unless* photons were present on both the $|1\rangle_c$ and $|1\rangle_t$ input rails in Fig. 2, the light emerging from each output line from the first BS block passes through the SHG blocks and the two DM blocks that follow on each line *without* modification. So, when the SPDC blocks downconvert single-photon Fock states at frequency 2ω to two-photon Fock states at frequency ω, quantum interference at the final beam splitter leads to the output state

$$|\psi\rangle_{\text{out}} = \sum_{n=0}^{1}\sum_{m=0}^{1} e^{i\delta_{n1}\delta_{m1}\pi/2} c_{nm}^{\text{in}}|\tilde{n}\rangle_c|\tilde{m}\rangle_t, \tag{31}$$

where δ_{k1} for $k = n, m$ is the Kronecker delta function. Equation (31) shows that we have realized the $\Lambda(S)$ gate with linear optics and coherent $\chi^{(2)}$ interactions.



FIG. 2. Schematic for constructing the $\Lambda(S)$ gate in the single-photon dual-rail basis from coherent $\chi^{(2)}$ interactions and linear optics. BS: 50–50 beam splitter. SHG: second harmonic generation. DM: dichroic mirror. SPDC: spontaneous parametric down-conversion. See the text for the explanation of how this setup realizes the $\Lambda(S)$ state transformation.

Conclusions.— We have shown that universal optics-based quantum computation is possible—in either the qutrit or qubit bases—using only linear optics and coherent $\chi^{(2)}$ interactions. Our proof of qutrit universality relies on the Lie algebra generated by the actions of $\chi^{(2)}$ Hamiltonians and number operators on states in the two-pump-photon qutrit subspace. For both the qutrit and qubit cases we have exhibited constructions for entangling gates that, together with easily realized state rotations, complete the universality demonstrations. Our findings call for continued improvement of $\chi^{(2)}$ nonlinearities with the goal of achieving the interaction strengths needed to make our gate constructions practical. Toward that end we note that state-of-the-art experimental realizations of strong $\chi^{(2)}$ interactions—including nondepleted four-wave-mixing-induced three-wave mixing in photonic microstructured fibers [29, 32, 33], $\chi^{(2)}$ interactions inside ring resonators [44], and nonlinear interactions in frequency-degenerate double-lambda systems [45]—are closing the gap between theory and practical applications of coherent $\chi^{(2)}$ interactions.

M. Y. N. and J. H. S. acknowledge support from Air Force Office of Scientific Research Grant No. FA9550-14-1-0052. I. L. C. acknowledges support from the National Science Foundation Center for Ultracold Atoms.

[1] Z. Yuan, B. E. Kardynal, R. M. Stevenson, A. J. Shields, C. J. Lobo, K. Cooper, N. S. Beattie, D. A. Ritchie, and M. Pepper, Science **295**, 102 (2002).

[2] E. Moreau, I. Robert, J. M. Gérard, I. Abram, L. Manin, and V. Thierry-Mieg, Appl. Phys. Lett. **79**, 2865 (2001).

[3] T. M. Babinec, B. J. M. Hausmann, M. Khan, Y. Zhang, J. R. Maze, P. R. Hemmer, and M. Lončar, Nat. Nanotechnol. **5**, 195 (2010).

[4] C. Chen, C. Bo, M. Y. Niu, F. Xu, Z. Zhang, J. H. Shapiro, and F. N. C. Wong, Opt. Express **25**, 7300 (2017).

[5] G. Gol'tsman, O. Okunev, G. Chulkova, A. Lipatov, A. Semenov, K. Smirnov, B. Voronov, A. Dzardanov, C. Williams, and R. Sobolewski, Appl. Phys. Lett. **79**, 705 (2001).

[6] W. H. P. Pernice, C. Schuck, O. Minaeva, M. Li, G. Goltsman, A. V. Sergienko, and H. X. Tang, Nat. Commun. **3**, 1325 (2012).

[7] J. L. O'Brien, Science **318**, 1567 (2007).

[8] A. Politi, M. J. Cryan, J. G. Rarity, S. Yu, and J. L. O'Brien, Science **320**, 646 (2008).

[9] J. Claudon, J. Bleuse, N. S. Malik, M. Bazin, P. Jaffrennou, N. Gregersen, C. Sauvan, P. Lalanne, and J.-M. Gérard, Nat. Photonics **4**, 174 (2010).

[10] J. P. Sprengers *et al*., Appl. Phys. Lett. **99**, 181110 (2011).

[11] A. Barenco, C. H. Bennett, R. Cleve, D. P. DiVincenzo, N. Margolus, P. Shor, T. Sleator, J. A. Smolin, and H. Weinfurter, Phys. Rev. A **52**, 3457 (1995).

[12] I. L. Chuang and Y. Yamamoto, Phys. Rev. A **52**, 3489 (1995).

[13] E. Knill, R. Laflamme, and G. J. Milburn, Nature (London) **409**, 46 (2001).

[14] P. Kok, W. J. Munro, K. Nemoto, T. C. Ralph, J. P. Dowling, and G. J. Milburn, Rev. Mod. Phys. **79**, 135 (2007).

[15] N. Ofek *et al*., Nature (London) **536**, 441 (2016).

[16] S. Lloyd and S. L. Braunstein, Phys. Rev. Lett. **82**, 1784 (1999).

[17] C. Weedbrook, S. Pirandola, R. García-Patrón, N. J. Cerf, T. C. Ralph, J. H. Shapiro, and S. Lloyd, Rev. Mod. Phys. **84**, 621 (2012).

[18] J. H. Shapiro, Phys. Rev. A **73**, 062305 (2006).

[19] J. H. Shapiro and M. Razavi, New J. Phys. **9**, 16 (2007).

[20] C. Chudzicki, I. L. Chuang, and J. H. Shapiro, Phys. Rev. A **87**, 042325 (2013).

[21] R. Raussendorf and H. J. Briegel, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 5188 (2001).

[22] S. D. Barrett and P. Kok, Phys. Rev. A **71**, 060310(R) (2005).

[23] D. E. Browne and T. Rudolph, Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 010501 (2005).

[24] H. A. Zaidi, C. Dawson, P. van Loock, and T. Rudolph, Phys. Rev. A **91**, 042301 (2015).

[25] M. Gimeno-Segovia, P. Shadbolt, D. E. Browne, and T. Rudolph, Phys. Rev. Lett. **115**, 020502 (2015).

[26] M. Pant, H. Krovi, D. Englund, and S. Guha, Phys. Rev. A **95**, 012304 (2017).

[27] C. Wagenknecht, C.-M. Li, A. Reingruber, X.-H. Bao, A. Goebel, Y.-A. Chen, Q. Zhang, K. Chen, and J.-W. Pan, Nat. Photonics **4**, 549 (2010).

[28] S. Barz, G. Cronenberg, A. Zeilinger, and P. Walther, Nat. Photonics **4**, 553 (2010).

[29] N. K. Langford, S. Ramelow, R. Prevedel, W. J. Munro, G. J. Milburn, and A. Zeilinger, Nature (London) **478**, 360 (2011).

[30] T. Guerreiro, A. Martin, B. Sanguinetti, J. S. Pelc, C. Langrock, M. M. Fejer, N. Gisin, H. Zbinden, N. Sangouard, and R. T. Thew, Phys. Rev. Lett. **113**, 173601 (2014).

[31] D. R. Hamel, L. K. Shalm, H. Hübel, A. J. Miller, F. Marsili, V. B. Verma, R. P. Mirin, S. W. Nam, K. J. Resch, and T. Jennewein, Nat. Photonics **8**, 801 (2014).

[32] A. Dot, E. Meyer-Scott, R. Ahmad, M. Rochette, and T. Jennewein, Phys. Rev. A **90**, 043808 (2014).

[33] E. Meyer-Scott, A. Dot, R. Ahmad, L. Li, M. Rochette, and T. Jennewein, Appl. Phys. Lett **106**, 081111 (2015).

[34] M. Y. Niu, B. C. Sanders, F. N. C. Wong, and J. H. Shapiro, Phys. Rev. Lett. **118**, 123601 (2017).

[35] D. P. DiVincenzo, Phys. Rev. A **51**, 1015 (1995).

[36] D. Deutsch, A. Barenco, and A. Ekert, Proceedings: Mathematical and Physical Sciences **449**, 669 (1995)

[37] S. Lloyd, Science **273**, 1073 (1996).

[38] A. Muthukrishnan and C. R. Stroud, Jr., Phys. Rev. A **62**, 052309 (2000).

[39] A. Yu. Vlasov, J. Math. Phys. **43**, 2959 (2002).

[40] R. K. Brylinski and G. Chen, eds., *Mathematics of Quantum Computation* (Chapman and Hall, Boca Raton, 2002), p. 79.

[41] A. Yu. Kitaev, Russ. Math. Surv. **52**, 1191 (1997).

[42] M. A. Nielsen and I. L. Chuang, *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information* (Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 2000) p. 292.

[43] C. K. Hong, Z. Y. Ou, and L. Mandel, Phys. Rev. Lett. **59**, 2044 (1987).

[44] Z. Yang and J. E. Sipe, Opt. Lett. **32**, 3296 (2007).

[45] C.-Y. Lee, B.-H. Wu, G. Wang, Y.-F. Chen, Y.-C. Chen, and I. A. Yu, Opt. Express **24**, 1008 (2016).